(*f*) the number of cases transferred from Vaikom Court to Shertalai;

(*g*) the file number in the Shertalai Court from 32-11-1119; and

(*h*) the number of Munsiffs in Shertalai Court on the above date?

MR. K. G. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI (*Legal Remembrancer*):

(*a*) 1-7-1115.

(*b*) The change was effected in 1115 when the territorial jurisdiction of the various courts in the State was readjusted with a view to relieve congestion of work in some of the courts where the pendency was very heavy.

(*c*) 1160 Ordinary Suits, 298 Small Cause Suits.

(*d*) 1399 Ordinary Suits, 165 Small Cause Suits.

(*e*) Two Munsiffs at Vaikom. Two Munsiffs at Shertalai.

(*f*) O. S. 227. S. C. S. 57.

(*g*) 2051 Ordinary Suits, 164 Small Cause Suits.

(*h*) Three Munsiffs.

Transfer of pakuthies.

178 ✻**MR. V. MADHAVAN** (*Vaikom* cum *Kottayam*): Will the Government be pleased to state:

(*a*) the policy adopted by them in transferring the pakuthies of Pallipuram, Thaikkattusseri, Panavalli and Mattathibhagom from the jurisdiction of Vaikom District Munsiff's Court to that of Shertalai Munsiff's Court;

(*b*) are they aware that the people of these pakuthies are put to difficulties and inconveniences due to this transfer of jurisdiction;

(*c*) have they received any representation from the people of these pakuthies complaining against the said transfer; and

(*d*) have they taken any steps to redress their grievances?

MR. K. G. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI: (*a*) They were transferred so as to correspond to the Revenue jurisdiction of the Shertalai Taluk and to relieve congestion of work in the District Munsiff's Court, Vaikom.

(*b*) At the time these pakuthies were transferred to the Shertalai Munsiff's Court, there was traffic convenience both by boat and bus. As these conveniences have been stopped now, a representation has been received from the inhabitants of these pakuthies.

(*c*) Yes.

(*d*) The retransfer of these pakuthies to the jurisdiction of the District Munsiff's Court, Vaikom is under consideration.

MR. V. MADHAVAN: ഈ പകുതികളം വൈയ്ക്കത്തേക്ക് തിരിച്ചുകൊടുക്കണമെന്നുള്ളതിനെപ്പറ്റി അടുത്തുതന്നെ തീരുമാനിക്കുമോ?

MR. K. G. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI: അടുത്തുതന്നെ തീരുമാനിക്കുന്നതാണ്.

Affidavits and petitions.

179 ✻**MR. S. SANKARANARAYANAN TAMPI:** Will the Government be pleased to state:

(*a*) whether there is any rule that all affidavits and petitions and other statements presented before the High Court must be in the English language;

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. S. Sankaranarayanan Tampi.]

(*b*) if the answer is in the affirmative when was it introduced, by whom was it introduced and under what provision of law was it introduced; and

(*c*) whether the Government or the Bar Associations were consulted before introducing the rule, if not why, and what was the reason for introducing this rule?

MR. K. G. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI: (*a*) and (*b*) Under powers vested in the High Court under Section 16 of Act IV of 1099 a notification was published from the High Court that all affidavits, appeal memoranda and petitions filed by Advocates shall if they are not framed in English be accompanied by an English translation.

(*c*) This does not arise in view of the powers vested in the High Court as notified.

MR. S. SANKARANARAYANAN TAMPI: May I submit that no answer is given to part (*b*) of the question?

MR. K. G. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI: Technically what the member says is right. It is true the date of the publication is not given. But at any rate my honourable friend being a member of the Bar would have known the date of its publication. I certainly concede that the date has not been given though in the question it was asked about it.

MR. S. SANKARANARAYANAN TAMPI: Can the member give the date of the publication now?

MR. K. G. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI: I am not in possession of the fact at present.

MR. S. SANKARANARAYANAN TAMPI: May I know what is the language of the court according to the Civil Court's Guide?

MR. K. G. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI: I think it is Malayalam.

MR. S. SANKARANARAYANAN TAMPI: Has such a circular been issued at any time before from the High Court?

MR. K. G. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI: Though the question does not arise, I may say for the information of the honourable members that it has always been the practice in the High Court to have all documents translated into English in most cases. The circular is only a further extension of that practice to give intimation to the parties as well as the advocates as to what they have to do in the matter.

MR. S. SANKARANARAYANAN TAMPI: May I ask the member, originally was it not the practice to obtain translations of documents only at the time of argument in the original Court?

MR. K. G. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI: My answer does not lead to this question. I limited my answer to what is taking place in the High Court and not in the original side

Representations from the Public of Shertalai.

180 ***MR. V. K. VELAPPAN NAIR**: Will the Government be pleased to state:

(*a*) whether any representation from the public of Shertalai for a change of jurisdiction back to Vaikom has been received by the Honourable High Court; and

(*b*) if the answer is in the affirmative, will they be pleased to state why the disposal of the same is being delayed?

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly